RESTORATION *Review*

In This Issue:

AGAPE: FOUNDATION OF CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP
by
W. Carl Ketcherside

There is only one passion which satisfies man's need to unite himself with the world and to acquire at the same time a sense of integrity and individuality, and this is love. Love is union with somebidy, or something, outside oneself, under the condition of retaining the separateness and integrity of oneself. It is an experience of sharing, of communion, which permits the full unfolding of one's inner activities.

—ERICH FROMM in *The Sane Society*

Volume 5, Number 2 **Second Quarter, 1963**

Volume 5, No. 2 **Leroy Garrett, Editor** **Spring 1963**

RESTORATION *Review*

A Quarterly Journal of Philosophy of Restoration

Dedicated to the Task of Defining the
Restoration of Primitive Christianity as the
Spiritual, Moral and Intellectual Ideal of

Modern Man

LEROY GARRETT, *Editor*

CLINT EVANS, *Publisher*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Editorial	
Who Is My Brother?	33
Principle Above Reputation	37
To “C” or Not to “C”	40
Around the World in 70 Days	43
Agape: Foundation of Christian Fellowship, *by W. Carl Ketcberside*	45
Review of Recent Literature	63

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

WHO IS MY BROTHER?

In dealing with the question "Who is my neighbor?", Jesus taught in the parable of the Good Samaritan that it is a matter of relationship. Your neighbor is one to whom you can show mercy. Neighborhood is a relationship between neighbors. The question "Who is my brother?" is to be answered much the same way, for it too is a relationship between people. As neighborhood is a relationship between neighbors, so brotherhood is a relationship between brothers.

My Christian brother is one who sustains the same relationship to the Christ that I do. He is *in Christ* just as I am, and this makes us "a new creation" together in Christ (2 Cor. 5:17). We have put on Christ together in that we have both been baptized into Him (Gal. 3:27). This means that one is my brother, not on the basis of what he has done for me or what I have done for him, but on the basis of what Christ has done for the both of us.

Brothers are in the same family together; they have the same father. They are heirs together, enjoying the same promises, privileges and blessings. Brothers are still brothers even when they fight like enemies. And a man might has some brothers that he does not know about, but they are just as much his brothers as those with whom he associates daily.

Brotherhood in Christ is possible only by the grace of God. Because of his great love for us, the Heavenly Father gave the Christ to save us from our sins. "While we were yet helpless, at the right time Christ died for the ungodly . . . God shows his love for us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:6-8). It is because of mercy that men can be brothers. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ! By his great mercy we have been born anew to a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." (I Per. 1:3)

Brotherhood is not the result of our own works or goodness. "He saved us, not because of deeds done by us in righteousness but in virtue of his own mercy, by the washing of regeneration and renewal in the Holy Spirit." (Tit. 3:5) We may say, therefore, that it is the Spirit that makes men brothers, and that those who are brothers are men of the Spirit together. "God's has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit which has been

given to us." (Rom. 5:5) "Because you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, 'Abba! Father!'" (Gal. 4:6)

Every child of God is my brother. A man need not be right on this doctrine or that practice in order to be my brother. Since the Heavenly Father adopted me as his son despite my many errors, and preserves me as his child even though I no doubt continue to be wrong about many things, then surely I can accept a man as my brother if he be the child of the same Father, irrespective of how right or wrong he may be on doctrinal issues. It is not how much he *knows* that makes him a brother, but it is what he *believes* about Christ.

Brotherhood is not based on any such thing as congregational or denominational affiliation. To be my brother in the Lord one need not belong to this or that church. Surely we all have Christian brothers who are Presbyterians, Baptists, and Episcopalians, but we share sonship with them, not because they are Presbyterians, Baptists, and Episcopalians, but because they are Christians — new creatures in Christ Jesus. (2 Cor. 5:17)

Perhaps I should say just here that it is *a Christian* who is my brother, which of course brings us to the question as to just what makes one a Christian. I appreciate Alexander Campbell's favorite definition that, "a Christian is one that habitually believes all that Christ says, and habitually does all that he bids him." He is more precise when he adds, "a Christian means one who first believes that Jesus is the Christ, repents of his sins, is then immersed on confession into Christ's death, and thenceforth continues in the Christian faith and practice."

We could not ask for a more unequivocal statement. I stand with Campbell just as he stood with Christ and the apostles. "He that believes and is baptized shall be saved." (Mk. 16:16) "Repent and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. (Acts 2:38)

It was in the same context, however, that Campbell realized that we are faced with a problem that did not exist in the early church — how about those that mistake the act of immersion and are only sprinkled? or how about the pious unimmersed? Are they too Christians?

In this regard Campbell wrote: "But who is a Christian? I answer, Everyone that believes in his heart that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, the Son of God; repents of his sins, and obeys him in all things according to the measure of knowledge of his will." He was explicit in stating that, "There is no occasion, then, for making immersion, on a profession of the faith, absolutely essential to a Christian-though it may be greatly essential to his sanctification and comfort."

He adds persuasively: "I do not substitute obedience to one commandment, for universal or even for general obedience. And should I see a sectarian Baptist or a Pedobaptist more spiritually-minded, more generally conformed to the requisitions of the

Messiah, then one who precisely acquiesces with me in the theory or practice of immersion as I teach, doubtless the former rather than the latter, would have my cordial approbation and love as a Christian."

He goes on to say, "It is the image of Christ the Christian looks for and loves, and this does not consist in being exact in a few items, but in general devotion to the whole truth as far as known."

Again he says, "While I would unhesitatingly say, that I think that every man who despises any ordinance of Christ, or who is willingly ignorant of it, cannot be a Christian; still I should sin against my own convictions, should I teach anyone to think that if he mistook the meaning of any institution, while in his soul he desired to know the whole will of God, he must perish forever."

Some of us will be uncomfortable with the view that one can be a Christian without immersion, for after all immersion is an heavenly institution, and it is the God-ordained act whereby the believer is initiated into the kingdom of God. And yet some of us are uncomfortable with the view that a pious believer in Christ is not a Christian, even if he has an obedient heart, only because of an insufficient amount of H20.

When I was a student at Freed-Hardeman College in Tennessee, one of my classmates obeyed the gospel, but it was observed by some of the students that in her baptism she was not completely submerged, for the elbow and part of the arm remained out of the water. The students advised the professor what had happened, but he shrugged it off as a technicality. It caused quite a furor. On the blackboards between classes students would write, adapting Rom. 6:4 to fit the occasion: "We were *partly* buried with him by baptism into death." After a day or two of this the girl was reimmersed — all of her this time!

Did she become our sister only when she was completely submerged? Suppose no one had noticed that it was not a complete submersion. Would she all these years only suppose herself to be a Christian, when in fact she was not in God's sight since the institution of immersion was not perfectly performed? "This is being ridiculous," one might say, "for the girl's intention was to be immersed, and insofar as she knew, she was." But was she immersed or only partly immersed? If her obedience was perfect, it is because of the purity of her heart, and of her attempt to comply with the outward form.

How many are there who have hearts just as pure, who believe in the Christ just as much, and who suppose that their baptism, which may be less than immersion, is the baptism of the New Testament? Campbell's definition of the Christian — one that believes and obeys in all things according to his measure of knowledge — includes those who have submissive hearts but who mistake the act of baptism.

Most of us are inclined to agree that it is the heart that counts, and yet we recognize that God has ordained an outward act to which one is to submit as an expression of that faith. And is one truly a Christian who has not actually submitted to that act as authorized of God?

I am not in a position to give an unequivocal yes or no to this question. Moses E. Lard gave an unequivocal no — one is not a Christian unless he is immersed, while Campbell's answer was an emphatic yes in the other direction.

This problem reminds me of the situation that now obtains in the case of my three children — or is it correct to speak of all three of them as my children. Two of them are legally adopted and are most certainly my children. But the third one, a little boy that arrived from Germany only a few months ago, is not yet legally my son. He is in the process of being adopted, but it will not be until the International Social Service gives the final word that the court will make him my son. He believes, but he hasn't been baptized yet!

When I met him at Idlewild in New York last Fall I managed enough German to explain to the five year old lad that I was to be to him a father and he would be to me a son. That has been the spirit of our relationship from then until now. But is he my son? In fact, no. In essence, yes. The court action that will legally make us father and son will make little difference. What is significant about our relationship — the personal love and oneness — is already present. The adoption warrant is important to the perfection of our relationship, but it is only the consummation of a process that began long before.

Paul assures us that the work of Christ was "to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive *adoption* as sons." (Gal. 4:5)

The new birth is an adoptive process, which is perfected in the believers baptism into Christ. I John 5:1 says, "Everyone who believes that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God."

Every sincere believer in the Christ is my brother in an important sense. We may liken *him* to the child that is begotten of the father and yet in the mother's womb, though not actually born into the family. A colleague of mine on a college faculty once referred to his wife's miscarriage as "a death in the family:' Just as the little German boy is in a sense in my family now, so is the believer in an important sense in God's family. One may be a Christian even if his obedience has not been perfected.

I have no half brothers or partial brothers in Christ, just as I am not in "partial" fellowship with some and "full" fellowship with others. A man is my brother or he is not. But there may be a difference between the brother who has more light and has thus perfected his obedience in baptism and the brother who has less light and therefore has not perfected his obedience.

The believer is referred to as receiving and being sealed with "the Holy Spirit of promise" Eph. 1:14. When men partake together of the same Spirit they are one together in Christ. This is "the fellowship of the Spirit" (Philip. 2:1) that makes men brothers.

It is not legalistic regulations of meat and drink that are evidence of brotherhood as much as righteousness, and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." (Rom. 14:17)

It is *the will of God* in men's hearts that makes them brothers: "And looking around on those who sat about him, he said, 'Here are my mother and my brothers! Whoever does the will of God is my brother, and sister, and mother:" (Mk. 3:34-35) None of us does the will of God perfectly; if we could, we would not need the Christ to do for us. It is when a man's heart is set to do God's will ("they will be done" is the essence of Christianity) that the important thing has happened. He may err often for lack of understanding or weakness, but his heart is surrendered to God. Men certainly cannot enjoy brotherhood together unless God rules their will.

PRINCIPLE ABOVE REPUTATION

The Bible assures us that "A good name is to be chosen rather than silver and gold" (Pro. 22:1), and this advice we all prize highly, but the Bible nowhere suggests that reputation (a good name) is to be chosen rather than *principle.* It is indeed foolish to sell one's birthright for a mess of pottage. Heb. 12:16 says that Esau was not only foolish but immoral for doing this. It may be even more foolish and immoral to sell one's principles for an acceptable reputation. To have "a good name" in some circles may mean one must forsake principle. Christian freedom calls for principle above reputation.

The great heroes of the faith were not men who enjoyed fine reputations in their day. As one checks a list such as the one in Hebrews 11 he finds that "Some were tortured, refusing to accept release, that they might rise again to a better life." It goes on to say: "Others suffered mocking and scourging, and even chains and imprisonment. They were stoned, they were sawn in two, they were killed with the sword," These heroes are described as "destitute, afflicted, ill-treated," and it says the world was not worthy of them. Such ones hardly made "Who's Who" or even the list of the brotherhood's top ten men. They were men of no reputation primarily because they were men of principle.

The apostles were certainly good and wonderful men, for even the foundations of heaven bear their names and they are destined to sit on thrones in glory (Rev. 21:14, Matt. 19:28). Though they rated so well according to heaven, they were "fools for Christ's sake" among men (1 Cor. 4:10). Paul refers to the apostles as "a spectacle to the world" and "in disrepute." He goes on to say: "To the present hour we hunger and thirst, we are ill-clad and buffeted and homeless, and we labor, working with our own hands."

He further says of the apostles: “We have become, and are now, as the refuse of the world, the offscouring of all things.” (1 Cor. 4:13) Speaking of their reputation in the world, he says the apostles were “treated as imposters” and “as unknown and yet well known” (2 Cor. 6:8-9).

This is all strong language. How many of us would choose to be thought of as *fools, imposters, refuse* and *offscouring?* Who wants to be *ignored* or looked upon as a *spectacle* or held in *disrepute?* But this may be the price of principle.

Take Jeremiah’s woeful cry: “I am become a laughingstock all the day, everyone mocks me” (Jer. 20:7). Who wants to be a laughingstock? Nearly all mothers want their son to be a success, to be highly applauded, and esteemed among men. The preacher today who is anything like a laughing-stock or “a fool for Christ’s sake” is a strange figure. This is an age when *reputation* counts, both in terms of money and success. Jeremiah would be a failure by most standards.

Jeremiah wails still more: “I have heard the defaming of many, terror on every side. Denounce, and we will denounce him, say all my familiar friends, they that watch for my fall” (Jer. 20:10). The man who expects to succeed learns not to denounce; he learns to play it smart. The man who dares to be different, especially in that he opposes the views and practices of those who support him, may expect to be denounced. If one holds to principle above reputation, he may have to pay in terms of cold cash as well as the icy reaction of his friends.

What kind of a reputation did Luther have? or Alexander Campbell? or any historical figure that made any real contribution to the world? They have all been rejected by their own people, sometimes being jailed and even murdered, but always spurned and mocked. The great scientists were all laughed at. The reformers were jeered. Suppose they had put reputation before principle? If one hopes to make any substantial contribution to the world, especially when it calls for an attempt to change people’s beliefs and practices, he must prepare to be thought a fool.

The most principled men oftentimes have the worst reputation, judged by popular standards. Ahab the king said of one prophet: “There is yet one man by whom we may inquire of the Lord, Micaiah the son of Imlah; but I hate him, for he never prophesies good concerning me, but evil” (1 Kgs. 22:8) Men often say of Micaiah’s kind: “He’s always been a trouble maker.” And he is not the kind that makes the college lectureships, nor unless someone puts him on by mistake. It was because of principle that Micaiah had no reputation. The record makes it clear that the prophet stood alone, for “all the prophets” in Ahab’s Court were saying what the king wanted them to say (verse 12).

Ahab was different. Even when told those things that would put pressure on most men, he replied: “As the Lord lives, what the Lord says to me, that I will speak” (verse 13). The prophet got into trouble. The last we hear of him he was in jail living on bread and water.

Was he a *successful* preacher? To say the least, men like Micaiah are few and far between — as rare as men who put principle above reputation.

In this regard one might ponder the words of Alexander Campbell, who knew men so well:

> It is a rarity seldom to be witnessed to see a person boldly opposing either the doctrinal errors or the unscriptural measures of a people with whom he has identified himself and to whom he looks for support. If such a person appears in any party, he soon falls under the frowns of those who either think themselves wiser than the reprover, or would wish so to appear. Hence it usually happens that such a character must lay his hand upon his mouth or embrace the privilege of walking out of doors. *(Christian Baptist*, Vol. 1, preface)

Check out Campbell's statement and you will probably find it true among the people you know. What happens to the men in the disciple brotherhood (or any brotherhood for that matter) that dare to be different? The party permits a man to fuss a little about this and that, and will even commend him for his courage, but the man usually knows how far he can go. One thing is essential: *his loyalty to the party must never be questioned.* If he is *sound* and *loyal*, if he conforms in the things that count, he may otherwise say or write a few things along that are even revolutionary. But he is like the sea, for he knows he can go so far and no farther. As Campbell puts it, he must "lay his hand upon his mouth or embrace the privilege of walking out of doors."

An interesting behavior of the unprincipled man who must watch his reputation with the brotherhood is the way he steers clear of questionable characters. While such characters, who are often high-minded men, would not corrupt his good morals, they might corrupt his standing with the brethren. You sometimes find this among the "don't quote me" and "don't use my name" group. They don't like to put things down on paper. They are very cautious what they say around the party leaders. They may think it, but they dare not say it. A group standing together may all think it, but no one would dare reveal it because of the fear of what the others would think.

The man who loses his reputation because of principle, and as I write this a number of names come to mind, can tell you how his "friends" drop out of his life one by one, each because of the pressure applied by party bigwigs — a pressure that is subtle and indirect, at first at least. Brethren become cool towards him, and sometimes they'll speak hurriedly and move on. A party man is uneasy in the presence of a non-party man. Sectarianism cannot stand a non-sectarian. So the sectarian must hurry along and find company with his own kind. Rationality is rare among men who must constantly guard their party reputation. They can't reason calmly and without passion. They must rely on the time worn cliches of partyism. They dare not think.

This explains why those who conduct these unity forums have difficulty getting a representative party man to join in. He may want to, but he must consider the cost, and usually he decides not to. The reason is simple: unity gatherings that by their very nature are composed of controversial figures (since only such ones dare do something different) are off limits for the party. It is not unquestionable conduct. One leaves himself open to criticism. He sees what has happened to others who would dare to keep company with non-conformists. There's his job, his standing, his reputation. How about principle? He will never admit it to himself, of course, but he will sacrifice principle for his reputation. He will find some way to save face, some way to rationalize and justify himself, but the one thing he must do is to stay within the good graces of those who support him.

This is why he must take care that he not identify himself with the wrong men through questionable association (such as a unity meeting). He becomes uneasy when he sees his name used in such a context. He has to keep his ear to the ground. What will be the reaction to this?, he asks himself. This is why men are more willing to attend unity sessions as "observers" *and in company with others of the party* than to take an active role. It is safer. When one serves as a leading figure in a unity effort, he may have to stand alone and even aloof from the protective confines of his own segment, and most men (nearly all) simply have not got the courage.

It sometimes happens that men who want to be principled will commit themselves to share in a unity program. They really believe in it and want to make a worthwhile contribution to better understanding in our divided brotherhood. They give their word to participate, and this they do in all good faith. Then comes the pressure and the handwriting on the wall. The unfree mind must yield. He cannot go through with it, so he manages to find a way out. It may not be rational, but he must get out of it nonetheless.

Nothing is so pitiful as a mind that wants to be free but dares not.

It is a question of values, which in Christ are so different than in the world. If one takes Christ's way he must abandon the values of the world. What is more contradictory than "Happy are the poor" and "Woe to the rich." The world has it the other way. Jesus teaches that the joy of heaven will amply compensate for hardship in this world. The man of principle will be rewarded: "Our light affliction is but for a moment and works for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory" (2 Cor. 4:17).

We need men who are willing to be different, willing to take a chance. To lead our brethren out of partyism one must *go on ahead* into new frontiers of thought. How about the reprisals? We need the spirit of G. K. Chesterton, whose principles constantly got him into trouble, who said: "I like getting into hot water. It keeps you clean!"

TO "C" OR NOT TO "C"

One editor among us complains in his journal of another editor's use of the capital "C" when referring to the Church of Christ. He says in the recent editorial: "He calls the Lord's church the Church of Christ, always using a capital 'C, thus equating it with denominational religious bodies." The editor goes on to criticize the other editor for his "constant use of the capital 'C' when referring to the church of Christ."

For some reason the small "c" has become one more mark of loyalty. It is a sure sign of one's initiation to orthodoxy. No *sound* writer would make the mistake of using the capital letter; he carefully puts it down "the church of Christ" without fail. For months, if not years, I have made it a point to observe this shibboleth among us. Rarely does even a neophyte make the mistake of the big "c" and never does the veteran keeper of orthodoxy.

To illustrate the point I have just thumbed through a recent issue of *Firm Foundation,* somewhat at random, looking for a reference to the "church of Christ." One article is a review of the book "History of the Churches of Christ in Texas." Since this was the *title* of the article, the rules permit the capital "C". In the article itself there are at least four references to the Churches of Christ, and each time the small "c" is faithfully employed, even in such a context as "The chapter on the period from 1906, the year of the first listing of the churches of Christ as a separate body . . ." One would suppose that if ever *Churches of Christ* could be used it would be in a context where a particular religious body is being distinguished from others in a historical situation.

This kind of meticulous care is typical. I recall years ago while attending a Church of Christ or church of Christ Bible school that a teacher belabored the point of the small "c". He was careful to list the few instances in which the capital "C" could be used. I was a very young man then, and I learned my lesson well, for after all these years I find myself sensitive to the very practice that I now wish to question. As an editor I also have made an issue of whether to "C" or not to "C', for I have rather habitually thought in terms of the New Testament church as the small "c" church. But I now wonder if this is not one more instance of our dilly-dallying.

This has made me conscious of what others do with the "c" when they are inclined to use the term *Church of Christ.* In such unlikely places as William Lillie's *An Introduction to Ethics* the Church of Christ is referred to with the capital letter, a reference of course to the universal church, and in Elton Trueblood's *General Philosophy* the "C' is used the same way.

An Anglican minister in Manchester uses the term as follows in a 1962 issue of *Expository Times:* "There are too many Christians whose interest in and concern for the Church of Christ never extends beyond the limits of their own denomination." It is apparent here that he uses *Church of Christ* to refer to all the saints of God, not simply to his own Anglican denomination.

Another Anglican, John Baillie, in his *Diary of Private Prayer* includes the *Church of Christ* in one of his prayers like this: "I rejoice, O God, that Thou hast called me to be a member of the Church of Christ. Let the consciousness of this holy fellowship follow me whithersoever I go." This does not appear to be a sectarian use of the term.

Even among the writers like John Locke we find *Church of Christ* used repeatedly. He says in *A Letter Concerning Toleration:* "Since men are so solicitous about the true church, I would only ask them here, by the way if it be not more agreeable to the Church of Christ to make the conditions of her communion consist in such things, and such things only, as the Holy Spirit has in the Holy Scriptures declared, in express words, to be necessary to salvation."

Again he says to all those that would arrogate to themselves such a claim as being the church and yet being factious in attitude: "How that can be called the *Church of Christ* which is established upon laws that are not His, and which excludes such persons from its communion as He will one day receive into the Kingdom of Heaven, I understand not." He emphasized his point by the use of the italics. Is not his statement a relevant one? Can the true Church of Christ draw the line on those that God will eventually saved? All of us might consider the possibility that if we reach heaven we may find people that we did not expect to be there — and others that we thought sure would be there turn up missing!

The term *Church of Christ* was used less frequently by our pioneers than by ourselves. Barton Stone did refer to himself as an "Elder in the Church of Christ," which is one of the earliest uses of the term in our history. It is this name also that graces the old meetinghouse at Bethany, one of the oldest buildings standing among our people. In her book on the *Homelife of Alexander Campbell*, Selina Campbell uses the term a few *times*, always with the capital "C."

I have noticed a few instances where Alexander Campbell used *Church of Christ*, though it was not his favorite nomenclature. In the 1852 *Millennial Harbinger* when writing about the disturbance in Nashville over the controversial J. B. Ferguson, he explained why he was in no position to discipline the heretical brother: "I am not a member of the Church of Christ in Nashville, and consequently have no authority there." In the same article he refers to something not believed by "a Christian church" in America, referring to the congregations of his own movement.

In *Memoirs of Elder Thomas Campbell* the Sage of Bethany refers to theories and opinions not being "the foundation of the Church of Christ," and on the same page he mentions the Holy Scriptures as all sufficient for "the edification and perfection of the Christian Church."

On and on it goes. These instances were gathered rather casually while in search for other points. It has been my observation that the term *Church of Christ* has been used rather extensively by all kinds of men of letters, and always with the capital "C." The

pioneers, though not often given to the terminology, also used the capital letter when they used *Church of Christ.* There may be instances of their using the small "c" in the rather awkward way it so often appears in today's brotherhood, but I have not observed any.

To be sure there is no great point involved here. The term *Church of Christ* certainly has its proper use, with or without the capital "C". My objection lies in the point that is made of it, as if it were a symbol of loyalty. We have to be so right about everything, even to the dotting of the *i* and the crossing of the *t.* We tithe stuff like this rather than weightier matters.

To "C" or not to "C"? I cannot see that it matters. If we were Germans it would hardly be a point, for in that language all nouns are capitalized. It cannot be a matter of how it reads in the New Testament scriptures, for the use of capital letters is a matter of the discretion of translators. Some versions use the capital "C" and some do not. In the original manuscripts all the letters were in the capital form!

It may be argued that since the church of the New Testament has no name, and certainly no denominational appellation, we sectarianize the church to call it *Church of Christ.* But cannot it be "sectarianized" as easily with a small letter as a capital one? And besides, that is not how things are sectarianized, for sectarianism is a matter of the heart. It is altogether possible that men like Baillie, Locke, and Campbell used the capital "C" *Church of Christ* with less sectarian intent than many of us who arc so orthodox in a small "c" kind of way.

We have to be so right about everything — except so many of the things that really matter!

AROUND THE WORLD IN 70 DAYS

When you read these lines the editor of this journal may well be in Taipei or Saigon, Hong Kong or Calcutta, Jerusalem or Athens, or Paris or Glasgow. By virtue of a grant from the Department of State, known in educational circles as a Fulbright scholarship, I will have the honor of spending several weeks in study at Taichung University, near Taipei, Formosa (Free China). Thirty professors from as many universities in the United States have been selected to take part in these seminars. We shall study Chinese culture, history, religion, and philosophy from the Chinese scholars themselves, and visit some of the cultural institutions of one of the oldest civilizations.

The sojourn in China not only involves a concentrated study of Chinese culture, but calls for interviews with Madame Chiang Kaishek, Vice-President Chen Cheng of Formosa, and Governor Chow Chihjou, and visits to the Psychological Warfare Center at Kinmen, and various educational centers. It is believed that the Institute will open a new era in Sino-American understanding. The thirty professors, all of whom are Ph D.'s, are

expected to return to their universities better prepared to promote East-West understanding.

After the Institute in Formosa the professors are flown to Hong Kong for a visit, where they are turned loose, and are free to return home however they please. I chose to return through Europe, which means of course that I will circle the earth, quite a journey for a poor boy that has never been anywhere.

My itinerary is breathtaking: San Francisco, Tokyo, Taipei, Hong Kong, Saigon (Vietnam), Bangkok (Thailand), Calcutta (India), Delhi (India), Beirut (Lebanon), Jerusalem, Tel-Aviv, Athens (Greece), Rome, Frankfurt and Stuttgart (Germany), Paris, London, Glasgow, New York, Dallas.

This will all happen in seventy days, traveling by air all the way. Besides the seven weeks of formal education in Formosa, I will have two days in Tokyo, three days in Hong Kong, a day or so in Saigon, two or three in Bangkok and Calcutta, and long enough in Delhi to see the Taj Mahal and a few other places and persons, almost a full week in the Holy Land with headquarters in Jerusalem. I made it a point to have at least three full days in Athens, Greece, two or three days in Rome. Paris holds less attraction to me, but I'll stop over for a day or so in order to visit the great universities and museums. Germany is important to me because of friends I have there, so I'll spend several days in that country, and will make it a point to drop by my new son's orphanage in Karlsruhe and say hello to the nuns that have helped rear him. And of course Dick and Nell Smith, longtime friends, will be a stopping place in Karlsruhe.

Copenhagen was originally on my itinerary, but we ruled against that in order to provide more time in London and Glasgow where I hope not only to visit the famous universities and some of their renowned scholars, but to call on brethren whom I have long loved by reputation.

All along the way I hope to contact missionaries who represent different wings of discipledom on these far-flung areas of the world.

As long as I am in Formosa and under the care of the Department of State I suppose I'll live rather high on the hog, but once they turn me loose in Asia and Europe I plan to live as close to the people of those lands as I can. I am more interested in visiting with people than in seeing things, more concerned with ideas than with mountains and lakes. In Formosa I will visit the homes of some of my Chinese students at Texas Woman's University.

Ouida and the three orphans will run things at home, and assuming that I make it back you might look for an editorial on what happened.

WHY WOMEN SHOULD BE EDUCATED

Women should be educated. And why? Because they then become more pleasing to men! Want of an education makes a woman turbulent, clamorous, noisy, nasty, the devil. On the other hand, an educated woman is all softness and sweetness, full of peace, love, wit, and delight. — Daniel DeFoe

---

If Stephen had not prayed, the Church would not have had Paul. — St. Augustine

---

Diversity was one of the fundamental foundations of our country, but now it is being frowned on. — Alan Barth

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

AGAPE: FOUNDATION OF CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP

W. Carl Ketcherside

"The Greeks had a word for it." This statement which has become proverbial indicates the wealth invested in the original vocabulary of the Greeks. Language is a medium of exchange and words are its currency. Since words are the symbols of ideas it is obvious that those who possess the richest deposit of words will be best adapted to the transmission of thought. The Greeks affect our culture today not alone because they had great ideas and ideals. They also had the vehicles by which to transport them to the realm of reality and to afford them to succeeding generations. Of all the languages adopted and adapted by mankind since God confused human tongues none other can compare with the Hellenistic in its fluency and fluidity.

An outstanding feature of the Greek language was its ability to indicate subtle shades of difference in meaning. Whereas other languages might be staid and conventional, the Greek was living and vibrant. In descriptive power it was unexcelled. Even today, in spite of our own acquisition of words from many sources we find it difficult sometimes to capture the essence of a Greek word and translate it into our own tongue.

It is admitted that ideas are stimulated by words even as words are the outward expression of ideas, but where an idea never enters the human mind by rational processes, no word can be coined or adopted to express it. Such an idea may exist in the mind of God and never be attained to by man because the infinite intelligence is unlimited whereas the human intelligence is restricted. The ways of God and the thoughts of God are not the ways and thoughts of men. They are higher than these are as the heavens are higher than

the earth. An infinite thought requires revelation in order to be placed upon a plane accessible to human understanding. By sheer exercise of reason the Greek philosophers pierced the veil of understanding and grasped the significance of the universe in which men dwell. Things tangible and intangible yielded up their secrets before the prying questions of men like Socrates and the investigative research of those like Aristotle. But there was one area in which their brilliant intellects failed to grasp the infinite and their eloquence proved to be wholly inadequate of expression.

"Love is of God." This statement in 1 John 4:7 accepted so nonchalantly by those of us who live this side of the cross was clearly beyond the grasp of the ancients. Certainly they knew much about love and a great deal about God, but the relationship between the two was never understood until it was revealed. That revelation came not in mere words as a system of doctrine for this love cannot be wholly confined to speech. "Let us not love in word or speech but in deed and in truth." "God is love." God is a person. If God is love then love is personal. This is different than saying that a person is love, for many persons are not loving or lovable. God is love but love is not God.

Because love is personal the highest manifestation of love is in the form of a person. "In this the love of God was made manifest among us, that God sent his only Son into the world" (1 John 4:9). We must not overlook the significance of the term "love *was made* manifest." It is not merely that love, in the abstract, was manifested to us, or toward us. It was made manifest among us. It became embodied, personal and visible. It could be heard, seen with the eyes and handled with the hands.

The Greeks personified many of their qualities, temperaments and virtues. They had their "Three Fates"—Clotho, Lachesis and Atropos. They had their "Three Graces"—Aglaia, Euphrosyne and Thalia. But they perceived of their gods and goddesses as merely presiding over certain aspects of existence. Hera was the goddess *of* marriage; Aphrodite was the goddess *of* love. Their sculptors, drawing upon imagination, sought to reproduce in stone an image of the words they had developed. It remained for the living God to make manifest in the flesh that quality which is said to be greater than faith or hope. "The Word was made flesh and lived among us." It is no wonder the classical writers had no word for this love because they had no idea of it. It was a new dimension in human understanding. It was a love that passed, or surpassed, human knowledge.

It is not at all a waste of time to discuss the terms for love in use among the Greeks and to differentiate between the attributes to which they gave vocal expression. The first we may mention is *philia,* or its verb form *phileo.* This had to do with a tender affection, a deep reverence or respect. It represents a longing based upon emotion and growing out of a need to recognize and be recognized. It is the term for the relationship among friends, for those who are close and intimate. Phileo is three times rendered "kiss" and every time in

connection with the kiss of betrayal bestowed by Judas upon Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane (Matt. 26:48; Mark 14:44; Luke 22:47).

This is the word used by the disciples with reference to the relation of Jesus to Lazarus. "Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest is sick" (John 11:3). It is also the word used by the Jews at the tomb of Lazarus when Jesus wept. "Behold, how he loved him." It is the word employed for those who "love to pray standing in the synagogues" (Matt. 6:5); for those who "love greetings in the markets" (Luke 20:46); and who "love the prominent seats at the feasts" (Matt. 23:6). It is obvious that men have deep yearnings for other things than friendship, or is this a longing for the friendship of the world?

Those who are interested in word derivation and construction find this one a fruitful source of interest because of its combinations. The most familiar, of course, *is* in the word *philadelphia,* brotherly love, where it is combined with *adelphos,* the word for brother. There is the word *philarguros,* in which it is combined with *arguros,* silver. This word *is* rendered "love of money" in 1 Timothy 6:10. Another interesting combination is with *agathos,* good, so that *philagathos* is translated "a lover of good" in Titus 1:8. We must not forget another interesting combination in *philautos,* translated "lovers of their own selves" in 2 Timothy 3:2.

THE GREEK "EROS"

Another word familiar to the Greeks was *eros.* In the classics this was the term employed to designate the amorous relations between the sexes. It became the term to express the passionate feeling demonstrated in sensuality and has come down to us in the word *erotic,* which is defined, "Of, relating to, or treating of sexual love, amatory." This word is never used in the new covenant scriptures in any of its forms, a fact about which Archbishop Trench, in his "Synonyms of the New Testament" comments as follows: "Their absence is significant. It is in part no doubt to be explained from the fact that, by the corrupt use of the word, they had become so steeped in sensual passion, carried such an atmosphere of unholiness about them, that the truth of God abstained from the defiling contact with them, yea, devised a new word rather than betake itself of one of these."

The new word to which Trench alludes is *agape* but it is possible that his conclusion with regard to the motive involved in avoidance of the use of *eros* is not wholly justifiable in light of the real facts. Testimony commonly quoted in support of the viewpoint is generally traceable back to Trench's thesis, and is derivative and dependent, rather than original. This only serves to show how popular and widespread was the influence of the book on synonyms which was first published at Cambridge in 1854. The religious scholarship of the world is always in debt to one who does such monumental research. Frequently, however, it is accepted as the final word on a subject and tends to stifle and discourage further investigation.

In our own day a great deal of study has been done on the relationship of *eros* and *agape* and the contrast between the two concepts which they represent. This renewed concern has been intensified by publication of a book which is considered to be one of the most important theological works of the twentieth century, *Agape and Eros*, by Anders Nygren. The author was ordained to the ministry of the Church of Sweden at the age of twenty-one and is now Bishop of Lund. As a result of his thesis there has been a stimulation of thought with reference to love within the Christian framework. This is especially true with the Scandinavian school of thought represented by such scholars as Anton Fridrichsen, Nils Johanson, Erik Sjoberg, et. al.

It is not essential to our presentation that we critically examine the difference between *eros* and *agape*. Enough works devoted to this theme are now available to the English reader that we could contribute nothing new or original. Our interest is not primarily in a word never used by the Holy Spirit but in one employed repeatedly by the divine agent of revelation. Suffice it to say, then, that *eros is* a love evoked or motivated by the beauty and worth of its object. *Agape* is spontaneous and unmotivated. *Eros* recognizes the value in its object and loves it; *agape* loves its object and creates the value within it. It has been pointed out by Nygren that *eros* represents an upward movement. It is man's way to God. *Agape* bends down and stoops to share our human lot. It is God's way to man.

DEFINITION OF AGAPE

It seems to me that in our struggle for efficiency in communication we frequently become victims of our own definitive process. We are so concerned to have an agreed upon standard for the meaning of our word symbols that we allow the dictionary to become our jailer as well as our judge. It serves not only to refine but also to confine our thinking. It is a false assumption that every great ideal is fully definable in human terms. Just as there are some things which cannot be purchased for money, our medium of exchange in the economic realm, so there are some things that cannot be secured by words, the medium of exchange in the rational domain. One such concept is *agape*. My own definition is admittedly feeble and weak. My only comfort lies in the fact that a definition provided by any other would also be inadequate.

Agape is "the energetic and beneficent good will which stops at nothing to serve the good of the beloved object." I have frequently broken this down into its components in an endeavor to distill from it everything that is extraneous and redundant. As it now stands it represents my own frail and feeble mental approach to a concept so vast that it is beyond complete description or definition. I ask your own analytical scrutiny of it that you may see how I view the word *agape* and why I say that it is the very foundation of all *koinonia*, fellowship, in God and with man. To the extent that we understand the implications of

agape our fellowship is strengthened and abounds. To the degree that we do not grasp it our fellowship must languish.

First, observe the word "will". Other words for love represent an act of affection, but *agape* is an act of achievement in the individual through the Spirit. It is not the expression of an emotion but the adoption of a principle by which to live. As respects *agape* one does not fall in love, he deliberately stoops to share. There is a difference between falling when you cannot help it and bending down purposely to help another. This accounts for the fact that love can be commanded. "These things I command you, that ye love one another" (John 15:17). The emotions cannot be commanded and an overt demonstration of them under compulsion would be mere pretense or hypocrisy. But that which is an act of will is subject to command.

By the same token the degree or intensity of that which results from exercise of will can be regulated by that will. Thus a command can be issued to increase the demonstration of love. "But as touching brotherly love (philadelphia) ye need not that I write unto you: for ye yourselves are taught of God to love (agapao) one another. And indeed ye do it toward all the brethren which are in all Macedonia: but we beseech you, brethren, that ye increase more and more" (1 Thess. 4:9-10). Thus, the apostle can write, "And I will very gladly spend and be spent for you; though the more abundantly I love you the less I be loved" (2 Cor. 12:15).

Next, observe that *agape* is always and unvaryingly *good* will. In that wonderful description of its attributes and characteristics given by the apostle in 1 Corinthians 13, he specifically says, "It does not keep account of evil or gloat over the wickedness of other people. On the contrary, it is glad with all good men when truth prevails" (J. B. Phillips translation). It is not selfish or egocentric. It does not seek for revenge or justification because its mere possession is its own justification. Like wisdom, it is justified by its own fruit or offspring.

It is *beneficent* good will. For this reason it can be extended even to one's enemies. It differs from *philia* which is affection for the pleasing, and *eros* which is passion for the beautiful and attractive. *Agape* is the ability to love those whom you cannot like. We like those of the same temperament, disposition and nature as ourselves, that is, we like those who are like ourselves. But the spirit of *agape* enables us to exert a beneficent goodwill, born of real concern, toward those who are unlike us and even antagonistic toward us. "God is agape," Therefore, God could love the world, and so love it as to give his Son. "But Christ died for us while we were yet sinners, and that is God's own proof of his love (agape) toward us" (Romans 5:8). It was "when we were God's enemies we were reconciled to him through the death of his Son" (verse 10).

Just as God proved his *agape* by what he did for us while we were his enemies so we prove that we are his children in the same fashion. “But you must love (agapao) your enemies and do good; and lend without expecting any return; and you will have a rich reward: you will be sons of the Most High, because he himself is kind to the ungrateful and wicked. Be compassionate as your Father is compassionate” (Luke 6:35-36). To the extent that we stop and question what we will get out of it our actions are motivated by *eros. Agape* is spontaneous and unmotivated. The love which is bestowed in order to receive response is prompted more by the need of the giver than that of the receiver. It is not a benefaction but an investment.

We have defined *agape* as being energetic as well as beneficent. This is important to a grasp of the nature of this love. “Energy” is a combined form of the Greek *en,* in, and *ergon,* work. It relates to that force which operates in and through a thing because it is inherent in it. *Agape* is not a force acted upon but a power which acts upon. It is creative while self-effacing. In a happy translation of 1 Corinthians 13:4, J. B. Phillips has caught this thought. “The love of which I speak is slow to lose patience — it looks for a way of being constructive. It is not possessive; it is neither anxious to impress nor does it cherish inflated ideas of its own importance.” *Agape* is creative. It is a fruit of the Spirit and the Spirit is what brought order out of chaos in the primeval world. The Spirit performs the same function relative to the problems of the new creation.

AGAPE IN EPHESIANS

The relationship of *agape* to the fellowship can best be understood by an examination of its use in the letter to the Ephesians, that great epistle of togetherness. In Ephesians 1:5-6 it is affirmed that “He destined us in love (agape) to be his sons through Jesus Christ according to the purpose of his will.” Fellowship is based upon sonship, fraternity is based upon paternity. This is not a mere afterthought of God. It is our destiny because it was his purpose and his will. God’s purpose is a unity plan and it is universal in scope. “For he has made known to us in all wisdom and insight the mystery of his will, according to his purpose which he set forth in Christ as a plan for the fulness of time, to unite all things in him, things in heaven and things on earth” (1:9-10).

This plan began by a magnificent work of grace in which man was reconciled unto God. Grace is extended not to the worthy but to the unworthy. It is always undeserved kindness. In this instance it was bestowed upon those who were sons of disobedience and children of wrath. It was those destined to punishment whom God destined to be his sons. In order to achieve this through Jesus Christ it was necessary that these be made alive together with Christ. This transformation which resulted in a new creation was an outgrowth of *agape.* “But God, who is rich in mercy, out of the great love (agape) with which he loved us, even when we were dead through our trespasses, made us alive

together with Christ (by grace you have been saved) and raised us up with him, and made us sit with him in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus" (Eph. 2:5-6).

Ponder well the threefold use of the word "with" in this one sentence. The great *agape* of God made us alive together with Christ, raised us up together with him, made us sit together with him. Here is divine *agape* functioning in three ways — resurrection, elevation and participation — with Christ Jesus. The plan to unite all things in him actually began by uniting things in heaven and things on earth. Alienation gave way to adoption, antagonism to acceptance.

The next step in the plan was to bring together those forces on earth which God recognized as existing in a state of segregation by reason of the barriers which had been erected between them. The entire world of mankind was divided into two classes by a fleshly rite. They constituted the circumcision and the uncircumcision. So great was the gulf between them that the former were regarded as those who were near while others were spoken of as those who were far off. Unless *agape* could resolve the problems of separation in this case it must ultimately suffer defeat. If it could bring these two divergent segments together it would demonstrate a power sufficient to batter down all obstacles to unity in all ages.

The motivating factor for oneness in Ephesus was the *agape* of Christ which was expressed by giving, offering and sacrifice. "And walk in love (agape) as Christ loved us and gave himself for us, a fragrant offering and sacrifice to God" (5:2). The Cross of Calvary represents the ultimate in *agape.* It is the apex of love, the peak which towers above all others on the horizon of the heart. Even those who were far off could see it and come to it. In our western mountains there is a range which bears the name of Sangre de Christo — blood of Christ. The setting sun turns the snow-capped peaks to crimson and makes it appear that they are splotched with blood. The Spanish padres accompanying the explorers designated these jagged heights with a significant title. We are reminded of the statement in Ephesians 2:13, "But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far off have been brought near in the blood of Christ."

Our peace is not a precept or a program, but a person. In him all dividing walls are dissolved, all hostility is halted. Unity is his creation and not an achievement of men. Men may keep or guard it but they cannot make it. The divine purpose is opposed to division and disunity. God is not the author of confusion but of peace. Wherever there are two divergent elements or factions it is the will of God that they merge into one. This was demonstrated from the very outset of Christianity. It was shown to be the ideal and the aim of God to make "one new man in place of two." This purpose has never been altered. "For he is our peace who has made us both one, and has broken down the dividing wall of hostility, by abolishing in his flesh the law of commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new man in place of the two, so making peace."

Note the expression "*so* making peace." It shows us the method of working under the "plan for the fulness of time, to unite all things in him." That method did not ignore the presence of the dividing wall of hostility. It did not pretend that the wall was imaginary or inconsequential. Instead it recognized that the wall was very real. But it did not demand that one group go around or climb over the wall and thus unite with the other on their grounds. It did not so much move the people as it removed the wall. The wall of hostility was broken down and when it was removed the people were together and the hostility was at an end.

Instead of fusing the two together he infused them both into himself. He instigated a fusion by eliminating confusion. He recovered for both of them a sense of their destiny, he restored to them a recognition of their real purpose. Love was not limited to the group on one side or the other of the dividing wall. Instead it made the wall which was once opaque become transparent and *agape* created a value in its object. Its object was shown to be mankind and not a particular kind of man. The cross which was a magnet for the good and honest hearts became a battering ram for the wall. The wall was broken down as hearts were broken up. Jews and Gentiles were not forced to submit to the power of God but to surrender to the love of God. The power was exerted against the dividing wall, the love permeated the hearts of the separated ones. He reconciled both to God in one body through the cross, thereby bringing hostility to an end (2:16).

We can learn much from God's method which will enable us to deal with our own tragic division in this generation. Jesus came to batter down walls, we have existed to build walls and claim to do so in his name and by his authority. He came to unite men, we have used his message to divide them. Jesus came to a divided world composed of hostile and warring forces. How did he proceed in order to weld them into one body? The answer is very simple. "And he came and preached peace to you who were far off and peace to those who were near" (Eph. 2:17). He came and preached! This is the method prescribed by *agape!* Conditions are to be alleviated by proclamation. It is the divine provision for overcoming division!

But you may argue that it is preaching which has caused our divided state. That is true but we must not overlook the difference in content between our messages and that of Jesus. He preached peace to create one body, we have preached the one body he created to pieces. We have been more concerned with building up walls than with building up saints. We have lost "the cross purpose" in life and have come to be at cross purposes with each other. Instead of bringing hostility to an end we have fed the flames. We have consumed one another instead of confirming one another in the faith. We will never remove our modern walls until we see and love as brethren those who are on both sides of them.

Jesus preached the same thing to those on both sides of the wall — peace! So long as there is schism in the fabric of brotherhood we are all in schism. In our currently divided state there is no such thing as one party being the loyal church or the faithful church. Those who sit down in complacency and comfort, regarding themselves as the chosen people in the exclusion of the rest of the scattered flock only exhibit their sectarianism and party spirit. Their isolation is a testimony to their factional outlook, their insulation is a witness to their ignorance and perversity.

But we will never better our state until someone arises who regards all of God's children as his brethren, not because they all see alike but because they all have the same Father. When someone under compulsion of a vision which makes no provision for division in the family of God begins to preach peace to those on all sides of our sectarian barriers there is hope of a brighter day. The message of Jesus was peace, and so long as we are separated and segregated from each other that is the needed word. Jesus grew up in a Jewish home and worshiped in a Jewish synagogue, but he knew nothing of Jewish provincial prejudice. He loved those who were far off as he did those who were near. Proximity was not the test of his love. No one could be so far that he overlooked him, no one so close that he looked over him.

There is a thrilling climax to that portion of the sacred scripture we are reviewing. It demonstrates that there is no ground for morbid pessimism regarding the walls of hostility in our day. We do not need to look upon division as incurable nor accept it as inevitable. With the preaching of peace walls will crumble and barriers break down. Things will no longer be as they were. Those who were strangers will become fellow-laborers. They will be yokefellows because they are yoked to Christ. This was the glorious hope held out by the apostle who declares of the once-separated forces, "So then you are no longer strangers and sojourners, but you are fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God." What power there is in *agape* to transform a stranger into a citizen or a sojourner into a member of the family.

No one would have dared to dream that the day would come when the Gentiles would be "fellow heirs, members of the same body, and partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus" (Eph. 3:6). This was the mystery of the ages but now that it has been revealed we should no longer regard it as mysterious. The apostle says that "we should have boldness and confidence of access through our faith in him (Christ)." Our power of comprehension, enabling us to probe the four dimensions of the spiritual life and to be filled with the fulness of God is dependent upon our foundation of *agape.* Thus, we not only enter into fellowship with God and Christ and with each other by *agape*, but we mature into that character which is saintly by the same means. Our increasing maturity brings a deepening experience of the nature and value of the *koinonia.*

The apostle prayed for the congregation at Ephesus, “that according to the riches of his glory he may grant you to be strengthened with might through His Spirit in the inner man, and that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that you, being rooted and grounded in love (agape), may have power to comprehend with all the saints what is the breadth and length and height and depth, and to know the love (agape) of Christ which surpasses knowledge, that you may be filled with all the fulness of God.”

It should be remarked that this great passage begins with the indwelling Spirit and the power conveyed by his presence in the believer. There is no indication that the Spirit is intended to alleviate our physical ills or delay dissolution of the man that is of the earth. Indeed it is specifically said that “though the outward man perish yet the inward man is renewed day by day.” There is a daily benefit for the believer derived from the Spirit according to the riches of the glory of God. Making room for the Spirit enables the Spirit to create in us that atmosphere in which Christ Jesus dwells by faith.

It is also through the Spirit that we are rooted and grounded in *agape*. The term “rooted” considers the Christian life from the standpoint of a tree; the term “grounded” from that of a building or structure. The roots are not seen but they act as braces to hold the tree steady that it be not destroyed by storm and wind. Thus it is with *agape*. Unseen though it may be we can see its effect in character that is unshaken by temptation and steadfastness that endures despite persecution. There is nothing shallow or superficial about *agape*. It grasps the soil of faith and anchors us in Christ Jesus. It puts down its tendrils and entwines itself about hope that never disappoints.

The New English Bible renders the passage, “With deep roots and firm foundations, may you be strong to grasp, with all God’s people, what is the breadth and length and height and depth of the love of Christ.” Any other foundation is one of sand. It is useless to attempt to build permanently without first digging down to lay the foundation in *agape*. It can be known though it is beyond knowledge. This simply means that as we grasp it greater vistas are opened unto us. Regardless of how much we learn about love there is infinitely more to learn. It is because of this inexhaustible supply that we can continue to grow in love without ever outgrowing it. Those who have experienced *agape* share in the riches of Christ and in the rich fellowship with each other.

It is not at all surprising that the apostle urges us in chapter 4:1-3 to put *agape* to work in the complex field of human relationships. The saints are urged to walk worthy of the calling to which they were called. Phillips translates it, “Accept life with humility and patience, making allowance for each other because you love (agapao) each other. Make it your aim to be at one with the Spirit and you will inevitably be at peace with one another.” This implies that peace with one another is conditioned upon oneness with the Spirit. Harmony is not the same as conformity. There will always be diversity but there need not be disunity. If we have *agape* for one another we will make allowances. Love takes into

consideration every circumstance. It gives the other person the benefit of the doubt and never doubts the benefit of doing so. The apostle says in 1 Corinthians 13:5, “Love has good manners and does not pursue selfish advantage. It is not touchy.”

Anton Fridrichsen writes, “What is agape in the New Testament? Love is unity in the community and with the community. According to the New Testament thought that is unity with Christ. When in Colossians 3:14 love is called ‘the bond of perfectness’ that means it is that which constitutes unity in the church (that is, perfectness). As the church is the Spirit’s creation and work, love is the Spirit’s first and most important fruit. There can be no real fellowship without love. *Agape* is the light in which we must walk as God is that light, if we are to have fellowship one with another (1 John 1:7). We are not required to have the knowledge that God possesses to be in fellowship with Him or others, but we are required to have His *agape* if we are to be regarded as “children of the Most High.”

If we attempt to produce unity by human creeds, confessions and concordats, we shall fail. It cannot be secured by dogma, decree or document. The unity of the Spirit is a gift of the Spirit to those who have the fruits of the Spirit and the first one of those fruits mentioned is *agape* (Gal. 5:23). While we try to bring about unity by conformity and base it upon affiliation with those whom we like we are sowing the seed of division. It is only when we love brethren whom we cannot like, those whose speech and actions grate upon our ears and nerves that we are walking in the footsteps of Jesus. It is not so much that we must like those with whom we sit together physically as that we love those with whom we are knit together spiritually. Paul prays for some “That their hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love” (agape). There is a difference between being tied together and being knit together. In the first, personal identity is preserved; in the second, it is interwoven and lost. The first is the result of *eros*, the second of *agape*.

We cannot afford to overlook the implication of the word love in two more passages in Ephesians, chapter four. After mentioning the bestowal of grace upon each according to the measure of the gift of Christ, the apostle affirms three things about Jesus. He ascended on high, he led a multitude of captives with him, and he bestowed gifts upon men. In clarification of this last statement he shows that these gifts to the people of God were special functionaries adapted to the developing of the saints. It was never the purpose of God that the body should grow through being ministered unto, but by ministering. It is as each part performs its work that the body moves toward maturity. Yet it is obvious that to be able to do this the members must be trained. For this reason Jesus has provided special functionaries or gifts.

“And his gifts were that some should be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, teaching pastors.” The purpose of these special servants is specified as follows: “With a view to training or adapting the saints to carry on the work of service unto the building up of the body of Christ.” The evangelists and elders are to train the

saints to minister. The community of God is an army. As enlistees, its members require training to carry on the warfare. They must be brought to and kept in combat readiness.

Verse 15 affirms that these must speak the truth in love (agape), and grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ. As I see it, the apostle does not here refer to our manner of expression when we speak. He is not saying we should be gentle and considerate in our choice and usage of words. All that is true, of course, and we should avoid rudeness and harshness. But to "speak the truth in *agape"* means to be constructive, helpful and upbuilding. *Agape* seeks the good of its object and we need to be certain that we have the proper goal and motive in our hearts. This will assist us toward maturity in all of the facets of Christian conduct.

Verse 16 points out that edification of the body is rooted in *agape.* Such edification results when the entire body is fitly joined together and the divine adhesive is love. When the members of the body effectively work together instead of against each other, when every joint supplies that which it is designed to supply and all are related through Christ Jesus, the result can be nothing but spiritual edification. All hope of spiritual strength lies in the implementation of love. With love our consecration grows, without it disintegration comes. Love brings increase and satisfaction, its absence produces decrease and petrifaction.

HEALING WOUNDS WITH AGAPE

Not only is *agape* the foundation upon which unity is predicated initially, but it is the healing balm which closes wounds and removes scars when schism comes. Just as a study of *agape* in Ephesians reveals that it is the basis of God's plan for unity, so a study of First Corinthians demonstrates that it is the divine program for restoring peace to a disrupted church. We are sorry that a community of saints became so involved in the party spirit as did the one at Corinth but we are fortunate to have the prescription for such an aggravated condition.

The congregation was divided over two things: the men who had special gifts, and the special gifts which men had. In the first instance they exalted certain men; in the second they exalted certain gifts. Paul learned of the dissension from members of the family of Chloe who had come to Ephesus. They told him that the fabric of peace had been rent by the party cries of the brethren. As Paul phrased it, "Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ."

The state of affairs was so bad that Paul actually wrote, "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius, lest any should say that I had baptized in my own name." So obnoxious was the party spirit to the apostle that he deplored any attempt to build a following around himself. In 1 Corinthians 3:1-4 he attributes the factional attitude to two things — childishness and carnality. In view of their status he could not address

them as spiritual men but as babes. They were not able to digest meat and had to be fed with milk. Just as the physical body is sick when the muscles will not coordinate, so the spiritual body is ill when the members do not act in harmony. The apostle declares that those are carnal and walk as ordinary men who indulge in envy, strife and division.

To call them back to a proper perspective, the apostle insists upon a correct evaluation of men. Paul and Apollos were merely servants and agents of reconciliation. They were enabled to serve only as God allotted his grace to them. One planted, the other watered, but both were helpless to produce and sustain an increase. This was wholly within the domain of God. He who plants and he who waters are one and that which is planted and watered by them should be one. The only foundation that can be laid is Jesus Christ. No preacher, teacher, apostle, or prophet, can build men upon himself. Only one who was crucified for us deserves our spiritual homage and loyalty. Since all of us must be built upon that one foundation there can be no room for division. “Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized in the name of Paul?”

In a burst of inclusiveness Paul exhorts, “Therefore let no man glory in men. For all things are yours.” It is ridiculous for one to say “I belong to Paul”; another to say, “I belong to Apollos”; and a third to say, “I belong to Cephas”; when all these belong to all the brethren. No one can exclusively possess that which belongs to all others by equal right. It is foolish indeed to be alone possessed by one who is himself possessed by all. “Whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and you are Christ’s; and Christ is God’s.” If we are Christ’s then everything that belongs to Christ is ours, and we belong to everyone who belongs to Him.

It is noteworthy that in dealing with the party spirit occasioned by exaltation of the leaders, the apostle does not in any sense minimize the importance of men. He only exalts the Lord Jesus Christ. Paul and Apollos were ministers by whom they believed; they were laborers together with God. Each was to receive his own reward according to his own labor. But each could build only on one foundation for no man could lay another foundation than Jesus Christ. No man could exalt himself because of his special talents or abilities for all of these had been given by another. It is the bestower of gifts not the recipient who deserves the honor. “For who maketh thee to differ from another? and what hast thou that thou didst not receive? now if thou didst receive it why dost thou glory?”

Just as Paul corrected the situation related to men who had special gifts, not by derogation of the men but by exaltations of the perfect man; so he corrects the situation created by the special gifts men have, not by minimizing the gifts but by exaltation of the only perfect gift. The treatise on spiritual gifts contained in chapter 12, 13, and 14, is one of the most interesting and thrilling in the new covenant scriptures. There were nine spiritual gifts and of their purpose and function the apostle would not have the brethren to

be ignorant. The Corinthians were not lacking in any spiritual gift (1 Cor. 1:7) and he did not write to them as he did to the Romans, “I long to see you that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift.”

But pride and selfishness entered into the exercise of the gifts at Corinth. When the congregation came together in one place those who had the gift of tongues and who were blessed with the power of utterance sought to usurp the time even to the exclusion of those who possessed the gift of prophetic utterance. The apostle begins his treatise on the theme of unity in diversity. In this he incidentally affirms the unity of the Godhood. “Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are varieties of service, but the same Lord; and there are varieties of working, but it is the same God who inspires them all in every one.”

It is obvious that if all the gifts, service and working, originated with the same source and if that source is not antagonistic to itself, then the gifts should not be employed to create dissension. So it is affirmed, “To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit to the common good.” It is further asserted, “All these are inspired by one and the same Spirit, who apportions to each one individually as he wills.” The human body is introduced as an illustration. The various members have different functions but these are not to oppose each other. Their efforts are coordinated and as each functions with due respect for all of the others in the body is made more powerful. No member can detach himself from the body by derogating his own function, no member can dispossess another who possesses a different ability. The grand climax of this argument is reached in the statement, “But God has so adjusted the body, giving the greater honor to the inferior part, that there may be no discord in the body.”

Note well the implication of these words, “God has so adjusted . . . that there be no discord.” When discord exists something is out of adjustment. When everything is properly adjusted there will be no discord. But what means has been divinely provided to readjust relationships when they go askew? Is the body doomed to disintegration when it gets out of adjustment? Not at all! There is a quality provided which is calculated to maintain harmony and to restore it. It is a divine solvent which eliminates all sources of friction and a tool which is perfectly calibrated to restore smoothness when rough places occur in the spiritual mechanism. “But earnestly desire the higher gifts. And I will show you a more excellent way.”

In 1 Corinthians 13, the more excellent way is revealed to be that of *agape.* In verses 1-3, it is shown to be indispensable; in verses 4-7 it is shown to be invincible; in verses 8-10, indestructible; in verse 13, immortal.

Even though one had the *glossolalia* until he could communicate with all men in their own languages, and could speak the tongue which celestial beings use in divine conversation, without love he would be a noisy gong or clanging cymbal. Even the most

cherished gift at Corinth when exercised in absence of love was but an empty noise. The one who had prophetic power to such an extent that he could fathom all mysteries, and solve the riddles of the universe, was nothing without love. The one who had the gift of knowledge so that he could reach out and grasp the understanding of the infinite was nothing without love. He who had the gift of supernatural faith before which hills melted and mountains fled in abject confusion, was nothing without love.

Please observe there is no Christian alternative to love. It is not a question of what we can be or have without love. It is not love or something else; it is love or nothing. There is no gain outside of love. Even if one gives away all of his possessions he had inherited or accumulated, in one burst of generosity or humanitarianism, he would gain nothing. Though he went to the stake and allowed his body to be burned because of the tenacity of his convictions, if he did so without *agape*, the act would be utterly profitless. We call death for one's conscience the supreme sacrifice, but this is not true. It is often easier to die for one's faith than to live with one's fellows. The supreme sacrifice occurs when a man gives himself unreservedly to the way of *agape* — the life of love. After that, death on the cross or at the stake is an anti-climax. It is but the capsheaf on a life of devotion.

The characteristics of *agape* demonstrate its majesty and power. "Love is patient and kind." The intolerance so often found in those who profess to be the children of God is not so much proof of love for truth as it is a manifestation of lack of love for those who seek truth. Kindness is related to grace which is merely kindness undeserved. The difference that kindness makes in the world can best be illustrated by Titus 3:3-7. The apostle paints a picture of the dire state of the world of mankind. Then he mentions, "But when the goodness and lovingkindness of God appeared," and goes on to show that the desert of the world blossomed like a rose.

"Love is not jealous or boastful." To put the cause of Christ ahead of every other consideration, to see others receive the praise for what you have accomplished, and to be able to rejoice in their attainments, all of this requires *agape.* Love does not boast of its own accomplishments but constantly seeks for that in others which it may commend. It is not given to flattery but employs compliments freely. One compliments another for the good of the other; he flatters another for his own gain. Love always seeks the good of the other. It gains by giving, it saves by losing, it finds itself in sharing what it has. To be able to place a correct valuation on the worth of one's own efforts is indeed a noble trait.

"Love is not arrogant or rude." Arrogance signifies the disposition to arrogate to self and to demand homage because of station, rank or position, either real or imagined. There is a difference between arrogance and presumption. In the first, a person esteems himself better than others; in the second he strives to lift himself to the level of those above him. Thus, the first relates to those who deem themselves superior, the other to those who count themselves inferior. Because the cross of Jesus makes us all equal and proves there is no

difference, *agape* cannot permit arrogance. Love is genteel and polite. It does not ignore the refinements of social grace but applies them to those who are in all stations in life. It bestows the more abundant care upon those who need it most. The apostle says, "On the contrary, the parts of the body which seem to be weaker are indispensable, and those parts of the body which we think less honorable we invest with the greater honor, and our unpresentable parts are treated with greater modesty." To be able to bestow honor in modesty is indeed a noble trait.

"Love does not insist on its own way; it is not irritable or resentful." One cannot help but wonder how many of the divisions which have beset the Christians of all ages could have been avoided and averted if the temperaments of those involved would have been under the mitigating influence of *agape.* It is a personal belief of mine that few of our actual separations were caused by the things which were credited with creating them. They have originated in the unhallowed dispositions of those who would exercise tyranny over the minds of others. The forces of stubbornness and self-will have taken their toll.

Closely allied with self-will is ill-will. The man who is least understanding and sympathetic toward others is frequently the one who demands the most deference for his whims and ideas. We speak of the irritation caused by objects which come in contact with delicate and sensitive tissues and surfaces. A tiny cinder irritates the eye. Love is not so thin-skinned. The man who possesses it is impervious to little slights and insults. He sees through the external attitude to envision a heart often starved for affection; he can even love a person who makes life difficult for him. He feels a sense of solicitude for the one who is upset by trifles and whose life is "bound in shallows and in miseries."

It is my opinion that *agape* may be indignant, although not resentful. Indignation can be a righteous feeling aroused when one sees a wrong perpetrated against himself or others. Resentment implies a personal dislike for the one who offends, while indignation is directed primarily against the act of wrong-doing. Love is not weak, compromising, or vacillating. It is strong and powerful in redress of wrong, hating sin even as it loves the sinner.

It is said that *agape* "does not rejoice at wrong, but rejoices in the right." J. B. Phillips translates this particular section thus: "Love has good manners and does not pursue selfish advantage. It is not touchy. It does not keep account of evil or gloat over the wickedness of other people. On the contrary, it is glad with all good men when truth prevails." This rendering is justified by the fact that the word "thinketh" as used in the expression "thinketh no evil" is a mathematical expression. In its original, it is a word belonging to the bank or accounting house. It means to "keep account" as related to business, or to "keep score" as related to tallying the results of a game. W. E. Vine points out that it involves more than "refraining from impugning motives." It is true that love does not imagine evil where it does not exist, but in this instance the apostle means that love does

not catalog and make a list of injuries or wrongs to be dragged forth at some future date. All of us have known persons who worked together for years until one felt that his rights were infringed upon, whereupon he sought to bring forth a list of grievances which he had been compiling through the years. Love never behaves in such a fashion.

"Love bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things." It would be easy to get the idea from a casual reading of this that love is soft, gullible, impractical and inconsistent. Far from this being the case, nothing is more firm, practical or consistent, than *agape.* Love continues to put up with things when all else has long ceased to do so. Its trust is unfading, its hope abiding. No circumstance, however dire, dims its faith that the future is in the hands of God and that in the ultimate His righteous purpose will prevail. Phillips translates with the words, "It can outlast anything." There is no power which can withstand *agape* for *"God is agape."* Were all to embrace love as the principle of life the powers of evil would fall before our advance like stalks of wheat before the mowing blade or scythe.

The difference between the gifts of the Spirit and this fruit of the Spirit, can be clearly seen in the fact that love is unlimited. The spiritual gifts were not unlimited in possession. They were not possessed by all and those gifts which were bestowed were parceled out. "To *one* is given through the Spirit the utterance of wisdom, and to *another the* utterance of knowledge according to the same Spirit, to *another* faith by the same Spirit, to *another* gifts of healing by the one Spirit," etc. Not all who possessed the Spirit as a gift were endowed with a gift by the Spirit, but everyone could have *agape.* In its possession there could be no rivalry, no jealousy, no clamor for special prominence or place. The humblest member of the body, the novice in the faith, the one who was least in his own sight could equal all others in this wonderful gift.

In the second place, love was unlimited in its application. It is written that "God so loved the world," and in doing so he made it possible for us to love all men, near and remote, those who are far off and those who are near. Even the gift of prophecy could only do good when men were in the physical presence of the speaker. "He who prophesies speaks to men for their upbuilding and encouragement and consolation." The exercise of this gift was limited by those who came into contact with the ones possessed by the gift, or with it. "But if all prophesy, and an unbeliever or outsider enters, he is convicted by all, he is called to account by all." Love could extend even to those who had never been seen. "For if we love not our brother whom we have seen, how can we love God whom we have not seen?"

In the third place, love is unlimited in its influence. In Titus 3:2, the saints are exhorted "to speak evil of no one, to avoid quarreling, to be gentle, and to show perfect courtesy toward all men." The reason is assigned that when they were previously "foolish, disobedient, led astray, slaves to various passions and pleasures, passing their days in envy

and malice, hated by men and hating one another" the kindness of God exemplified in *agape*, came and transformed them. By an exercise of this divine endowment we can change the world in which we live and become "more than conquerors through Him who loved us."

In the fourth place, love is unlimited in endurance. The spiritual gifts were temporary in nature, but love is permanent. "Love never ends; as for prophecy, it will pass away; as for tongues, they will cease; as for knowledge, it will pass away." Such words as "cease" and "pass away" have no place in the vocabulary of *agape.* Love is not circumscribed by time or space. When calendars are no longer needed "and they count not time by years", love will remain steadfast and enduring. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but the love of God like the word of God, endures forever.

Again, love is unlimited in its greatness. It is one of the triad of abiding things. These are the majestic qualities which are not transitory. Faith is great, hope is great, but love is the greatest of all. Greater than tongues which, in their multiplicity, are the sign of man's attempt to thwart God's purpose, greater than prophecy which represents the conveyance of divine thought in human language, greater than that knowledge which is the grasp of God's revelation — greater than all of these is *agape* — for God who is the source of language, revelation, and knowledge, is *agape.*

The festering wounds of partisanship at Corinth could be closed and healed, and the tissue of brotherhood become well and strong again through *agape.* It was the golden cord which could pierce the fabric on both sides of any rent and draw it together again. Paul recognizes the function of the gifts and he does not deprecate their use. He only says, "Make love your aim, and earnestly desire the spiritual gifts." Any gift is safe in the hands of him whose heart is ruled by love. The same injunction comes to the divided, suspicious and splintered church of God in our own day. "Make love your aim." If we do this in sincerity, in the fulness of its scriptural meaning, we have nothing to fear.

When men formulate their programs, when they seek to implement the longing of their human hearts through organizations we cannot sanction and which violate our consciences, let us cultivate that spirit of *agape* which will make association possible even where endorsement is not. Thus, let us bring to bear upon every segment of our separated brethren a love that transcends all else. In spite of differences we will see a growing sense of togetherness. We shall have a realization of a common longing, a common striving, and the hope of a common destiny. When we loose agape in our lives we also free the Spirit to work in us and through us. As instruments, weak, frail and fallible, though we may be, he can still employ us and make us fit for the Master's service.

We can never overthrow sectarianism by creating another sect filled with hate and intolerance; we cannot overcome denominationalism through exercise of the party spirit. Too long have we eaten the "apples of Sodom" which turn to acrid ashes in our mouths.

Let us begin to taste that fruit of the Spirit which leaves no bitterness in our hearts. As Paul wrote to the Colossians, “Above everything else, be truly loving, for love is the golden chain of all the virtues.” As the poet, John Oxenham, wrote in his “Chaos, and the Way Out”

Then was earth made anew where’er He went,
For all men’s hearts were opened to the Light,
And Christ was King, and Lord Omnipotent.
And everywhere men’s hearts turned unto Him
As to the very source and fount of right,
As flowers turn to the sun, and everywhere
New Life sprang up to greet Him as He went
Dispensing grace to all men everywhere.
And His dispensed grace changed all men’s hearts,
Made His will theirs, and their wills wholly His;
So that they strove no more each for himself,
But each for good of all, and all for Him;
Man’s common aim was for the common good;
The age-old feuds were of the past,
And all mankind joined hands at last
And every man in all the whole wide world
Had room, and time, and wherewithal to live
His life at fullest full within the Law —
The Law that has no bounds or bonds for those
Who live it, for it is His Love —
The great unchanged, unchanging, and unchangeable
Law whose beginning and whose end is — Love.

Secrecy is indispensable to the existence of personhood and to the growth of persons. Man knows and responds to God and his fellow man in the deepest, most private, most hidden area of his life. When this hiddenness is dissipated, either by his own choice or through pressures from outside, a man is no longer able to enter into meaningful

relationships with others. Discipline belongs to the area of personal life that needs to be kept hidden. The cost of in discriminate revealing of one's discipline is to lose it altogether or to make it into a law. — F. O. Ayres

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

Thoughts on Fellowship, W. Carl Ketcherside, Mission Messenger, St. Louis, 1962, $3.50.

This is a reprint edition of *Mission Messenger* for 1957-58, edited by Carl Ketcherside. This is the only way to get all the copies for these years, and it will someday be a collector's item. The reprint issue is well named, for many of the editorials bear the title *Thoughts on Fellowship*, and many of the articles and correspondence have to do with problems on unity and fellowship.

Editor Ketcherside is obviously a concerned man, as editors should be, and he is the kind of writer that bears a re-reading. If you have read the editor's writings for these years, but have let the copies get away from you, here is a splendid way to have them preserved in your library, to read again and again, and to mark certain passages for further study in depth. Few editors have as much to say as Ketcherside, and few can say it so well.

Protestant-Catholic Marriage, C. Stanley Lowell, Broadman Press, Nashville, 1962, $2.75.

Anyone contemplating a mixed marriage, whether he be Jewish, Roman Catholic, or Protestant, should read this book. It has an urgent message, and it sets forth facts that are disturbing. The chapter on "Living With It" will cause anyone to think twice before getting into it. The official Roman Catholic position is explained fairly, with the oaths and requirements included.

Christian is the Name of the Church, J. O. Hunt, published by author, 1962, $4.00.

The author of this work not only believes that "Christian Church" is *the* name for the congregation of Christ, but that it is only in this Name that unity is possible. It may be that his arguments are less than persuasive, but he deserves a hearing, and here is hoping he will get one. Some of us are convinced that the church has no name as such, and that this matter is not as vital as Mr. Hunt thinks; but his concern is commendable, and it is best to let each reader decide for himself.

The People of The Way, by a Saint to the Saints, Bible Truth Depot, Swengel, Pa., 1961, $3.75.

The anonymous author of this book is a Baptist minister that does not talk like a Baptist. As in our own case, this man is concerned greatly about unity and fellowship. It is a daring book. He calls on well-known evangelical leaders to call a mass meeting in which they shall declare themselves "The People of the Way," thus breaking down all the party names and sectarian conditions of fellowship. He says these men, whom he calls by name, should declare: "We have pledged to the Lord, and to each other, that from that day forward (some date they decide on) there shall be only one condition for fellowship among us: the individual's faith in Jesus Christ, his confession of that faith, and his willingness to take his stand with THE PEOPLE OF THE WAY." He believes that something great can and will happen for those who seek the unity of the Sprit. This "movement" for unity will begin at the grassroots: "The saints of God, the humble saints, that is, are sick and tired of all the feuding that is going on. They want to live for the Lord, and they dislike being made the pawns in the hands of leaders whose contradictory causes make fellowship among them impossible. There is a cry arising in the hearts of the Israel of God; they want to be delivered from their slavery." You'd better let us send you this book, for we can't tell it all here.

The Ministry of the Laity, F. O. Ayres, Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1962, $2.50.

Too many books are too highly priced. This one is not, and it is most certainly worth the reading. Mr. Ayres' premise is that all saints of God are ministers, whether they realize it or not. From this premise he goes on to answer a very vital question: what does it mean to be a Christian? The answer is that it means to be a servant or minister of Christ, and the author enlarges upon this magnificently. His chapters on Awareness ("You are a minister; therefore be aware") and Affirmation ("You are a minister; therefore affirm life") are urgent pleas for an awakening of the modern church. Much better than most of our own people does Mr. Ayres grasp the concept of the ministry of all believers.

The King of the Earth, Erich Sauer, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1962, $3.95.

The subtitle of this weighty book is "the nobility of man according to the Bible and Science," which summarizes the content of the famous Erich Sauer's latest work. It is man who is the king of the earth, made so by the fiat of God. If you are looking for a study of man from the Christian perspective, this is it. Some chapter titles alone should motivate you: Man the crown of creation, the earthly kingship of man, the divine nobility of true Christian living, holiness and glory. There is extended treatment of questions regarding creation. This book is for the more serious student, and yet it is not technical or abstruse.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

OFFICE NOTES

The essay by Carl Ketcherside will be followed by another entitled *The Ground of Christian Fellowship.* The latter one has appeared in the *Missouri Christian Lectures for* 1961, while the

first one was delivered at the lectureship and may also be published. We are grateful to the Bible Book Store, 314 S. Park Blvd., San Antonio, Texas, the publisher of the lectures, for permitting us to use this material. We hope we may be able to issue in booklet form these two essays together.

With the completion of this fifth volume of *Restoration Review.*. which comes with two more numbers, we plan to issue the journal on monthly basis. Your renewal will carry you into the monthly issues on the same basis, for the subscription price will not change. We will describe the changes we have planned for the monthly issues at a later time.

As this goes to press the Unity Forum, conducted in Dallas at the Wynnewood Christian Chapel, 2303 S. Tyler, is in progress. We are happy to report that there is keen interest shown by brethren from nearly all groups of disciples. The chapel has been filled to capacity, and local interest is good. We should like to see such meetings become annual affairs with other congregations in the area sharing in it on a rotation basis. To those of our brethren who criticize such efforts, but who at the same time state that they *do* believe in unity efforts, we invite them to hold such gatherings for unity as would be proper. If we are not doing in the right way what they admit ought to be done, then let them show us how to do it. We have invited them to ours and they will not come. Now let them conduct one and invite us.

Published in January, April, July, and October by Restoration Press, 1916 Western Dr., Alton, Illinois.
Subscription rate is $1.00 per annum; single copies 50 each.

Entered as second class matter at post office at Alton, Illinois.

*Mailing Address: RESTORATION *Review*
1916 Western Drive
Alton, Illinois